

**Answer**

**Authorized officer: SHIMADA Kenji**

**1. International application No. PCT/JP03/02562**

**2. Applicant**

**Name: BOSCH AUTOMOTIVE SYSTEMS CORPORATION**

**Mailing Address: 6-7, Shibuya 3-chome, Shibuya-ku,  
Tokyo 150-0002, Japan**

**Nationality: Japan**

**Address: Japan**

**3. Representative**

**Name: ISHII Hiroki, No. 9545 (Patent Attorney)**

**Mailing Address: Kimuraya Building 6F, 2-5-22,  
Kyobashi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo 104-0031,  
Japan**

**4. Date of Notification**

**PCT Comment: December 24, 2003**

**Notification for extension of period: March 2, 2004**

## 5. Content of Answer

The examiner's comments on the aforementioned application (PCT Comment dated December 24, 2003) are as follows:

The inventions of Claims 9, 10 and 22 lack inventive step in view of the below references cited in the International Search Report.

Cited Reference 1: Japanese Utility Model Application No. 66416/1989 (Microfilm of the specification and drawings annexed to the request of Japanese Utility Model Application Publication No. 6045/1991)

Cited Reference 2: JP11-257187A

Furthermore, the invention of Claim 11 lacks inventive step in view of the cited references 1 and 2 in the International Search Report, as well as of the following reference.

Cited Reference 3: JP56-546A

In response to these comments, the applicant amends the specification and provides its opinion as stated below.

- (1) The original claims 9 through 11 were cancelled.
- (2) Claim 12, originally a dependent claim of Claim 10 or 11, was amended to an independent claim based on the cancellation of the original Claims 9 through 11.
- (3) The original Claim 22 was amended concerning its dependence based on the cancellation of the original Claims 9 through 11, to be more

specific, it was amended to a dependent claim of the amended Claim 12.

- (4) As the results of the aforementioned amendments, we think that there is no longer any ground for considering that the inventions of Claims 9 through 11, and 22 lack inventive step.
- (5) New Claim 46 was added. The invention of the new Claim 46 corresponds to the invention of Claim 1. While the invention of Claim 1 includes a "DME fuel supply device," the invention of the new Claim 46 includes a focused limitation, that is a part of the "DME fuel supply device," to a "pressure delivery device" for forcibly delivering residual DME fuel under pressure towards a residual fuel retrieving means.

The nature of the invention of the new Claim 46 is identical to that of the invention of Claim 1. We therefore think that the invention of the new Claim 46 also involves inventive step as the invention of Claim 1 does.

- (6) New Claim 47 was added. The invention of the new Claim 47 corresponds to the invention of Claim 23. The new Claim 47 is described based on the review of the elements directly linked with the effects of the invention of Claim 23. This addition is within the scope of the description in the originally filed specification.

The nature of the invention of the new Claim 47 is identical to that of the invention of Claim 23. We therefore think that the invention of the new Claim 47 also involves inventive step as the invention of Claim 23 does.

- (7) New Claim 48 was added. The invention of the new Claim 48 corresponds to the invention of Claim 32. The new Claim 48 is described based on the review of the elements directly linked with

the effects of the invention of Claim 32. This addition is within the scope of the description in the specification originally filed.

The nature of the invention of the new Claim 48 is identical to that of the invention of Claim 32. We therefore think that the invention of the new Claim 48 also involves inventive step as the invention of Claim 32 does.

- (8) New Claim 49 was added. The invention of the new Claim 49 corresponds to the invention of Claim 34. The new Claim 49 is described based on the review of the elements directly linked with the effects of the invention of Claim 34. This addition is within the scope of the description in the specification originally filed.

The nature of the invention of the new Claim 49 is identical to that of the invention of Claim 34. We therefore think that the invention of the new Claim 49 also involves inventive step as the invention of Claim 34 does.